

Gary M. Hoffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Kenneth W. Brothers(*Pro Hac Vice*)
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
2101 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
Phone (202) 420-2200
Fax (202) 420-2201

Edward A. Meilman (*Pro Hac Vice*)
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
Phone (212) 277-6500
Fax (212) 277-6501

Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715
Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008
ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAINE
177 Post Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, California 94108
Phone (415) 421-7151
Fax (415) 362-8064

Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AEROFLEX ET AL,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CV 03-4669 MJJ (EMC)
CASE NO. CV 03-2289 MJJ (EMC)

MANUAL FILING NOTIFICATION

SYNOPSISYS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Defendant.

CASE NOS. CV 03-4669 MJJ (EMC) AND CV 03-2289 MJJ (EMC)
MANUAL FILING NOTIFICATION

Regarding: the confidential/unredacted version of the following documents:

1. RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION OF NON-INFRINGEMENT NO. 1 (RTL);
2. RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT (HARDWARE CELLS) (NO.2);
3. RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF CLAIMS 13-17 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 4,922,432 (NO. 4);
4. RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' SUMMARY JUDGEMENT MOTION OF NON-INFRINGEMENT (OTHER ELEMENTS) (NO. 6);
5. RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING THE SCOPE OF PATENT DAMAGES FOR ALLEGED INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 4,922,432 (NO. 7); AND RICOH'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF LACHES DEFENSE (NO. 8).

This filing is in paper or physical form only. This filing has been served on counsel for Synopsys/ASIC Defendants. For information on retrieving this filing directly from the court, please see the court's main web site at <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

This filing was not e-filed for the following reason(s):

☐ Voluminous Document (PDF file size larger than the e-filing system allows)

☐ Unable to Scan Documents

☐ Physical Object (description): _____

☐ Non-Graphic/Text Computer File (audio, video, etc.) on CD or other media

☒ Item Under Seal

☐ Conformance with the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy (General Order 53).

☐ Other (description): _____

1
2 Dated: September 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

3 Kenneth W. Brothers
4 Gary M. Hoffman
Dickstein Shapiro LLP

5 Jeffrey B. Demain
6 Jonathan Weissglass
Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin & Demain

7
8 By: /s/
Kenneth W. Brothers

9
10 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.